



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## Notes and Opinions.

---

**That Apollos knew an Early Written Gospel.**—Writing in defense of this proposition, Professor Blass, of Halle, author of the recent great commentary on Acts, says in the *Expository Times* for September: "In my Commentary I have expressed myself with some caution: videlicet *non sine scripto aliquo evangelio*. And this I hold for certain. If Apollos had been instructed by some disciple of the apostles, without a gospel, the result must have been that Apollos was fully acquainted with the teaching of the apostles, and especially with their rite of baptism; nay, he would have been baptized himself after that rite. On the other hand, he would have got a very imperfect knowledge of Christ's life and teaching. Now, we see that quite the contrary was the case: he was very accurately instructed with regard to "the things concerning Jesus," whilst he knew nothing at all of the apostles' baptizing. From this I infer that the chief means of his conversion had been a book, and not the ignorant person by whom that book had been brought to him. And so we must assume that about the year 50 A. D. (roughly speaking) there already existed a written gospel. I am fully aware that this is contrary to the opinion generally adopted in my country; but that opinion, formed by men living at such an enormous distance from the events, has no weight at all. The want which claimed and produced written gospels arose immediately after the departure of the apostles from Jerusalem (which took place before 54 A. D., Acts 21). Up to that time St. Peter and his colleagues had regularly taught the people out of their living recollection; but afterwards it became necessary to '*reconstruct*' from memory (Luke 1:1) a narrative of Christ which might be rehearsed in the weekly assemblies, just as was done in the time of Justin the Martyr. I suppose, then, that soon after the council (Acts 15, A. D. 45 or 46) St. Peter left Jerusalem and went to Antioch first (Gal. 6:11), and by that way, *perhaps*, to Babylon; you will see that there is space of time enough for the gospels being written, copied, brought to Alexandria, and so on, before the year 50. And *if* that gospel was that of St. Mark, mutilated as we have it now (16:8), Apollos could not learn from it any other form of Christianity than that which he actually had. Moreover, the ancient tradition will in some sense be true, that St. Mark was the first bishop of Alexandria."

**The Incarnation, according to Phil. 2:5-11.**—Two articles upon the interpretation of this crucial passage, by Dr. E. H. Gifford, appear in the *Expositor* for September and October. The conclusion of his discussion regarding the

meaning of this passage he gives in these words ; " 1) We have seen that the word *ὑπάρχων*, *subsisting*, as used by St. Paul, denotes both the preëxistence and the continued existence of Christ *in the form of God*. 2) In illustration and confirmation of Bishop Lightfoot's interpretation of the word *μορφή* as 'essential form,' it has been shown that this sense was well known to contemporaries of St. Paul, that it was adopted generally by the early Greek Fathers, and advisedly restored to our English Bible by the translators of the Authorized Version in A.D. 1611. 3) We have examined the opposite theory of those who contend that the *form* is separable from the *nature* and *essence* that they can exist without it, and that in the Incarnation the Son of God did in fact empty himself of the *form*, while retaining the essential nature of deity. This error has been traced to its source in the false definitions of Zanchi ; and it has been shown that the Son could not possibly empty himself of the *form* of God without thereby ceasing to be God in any true sense. 4) Next we have seen that *ἰσα θεῷ* denotes the manifold circumstances of glory and majesty, or the particular modes of manifestation, which were an adequate expression of the divine nature of the Son, but not inseparable from it. 5) It has been seen that the meaning of the clause *οὐχ ἀπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἰσα θεῷ*, and its direct antithesis to *ἀλλ' ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε*, clearly prove that what the Son of God laid aside at the Incarnation was that equality of condition, such as glory, majesty, and honor, which he possessed in his preëxistent state, and to which he prayed to be restored, in John 17 : 5, 'And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.' 6) We have seen how the apostle sets forth on the other hand the fulness of Christ's humanity in a climax advancing from its most general to its most special features,—from that *form of a servant* which includes all God's creatures as *ministers of his who do his pleasure*, to that *likeness of men* which unites him with us in our true nature as made *in the image of God*,—and finally to that outward guise and fashion, in which he was seen as a *man of sorrows and acquainted with grief*, humbling himself yet further in obedience to his Father's will unto death, even the death of the cross. St. Paul has thus shown us in brief outline the essential features of the Incarnation, the perfect Godhead and perfect Manhood united in one divine person, and 'never to be divided,' seeing that the human nature, denoted in the name Jesus, is now highly exalted in inseparable union with the divine. But as to the manner in which those two natures are united in one person,—as to the degree in which the deity was limited or the humanity exalted by their union, *during Christ's life on earth*,—the apostle has said nothing whatever in this passage."

**Leprosy.**—The view which medical science has come to take of leprosy, after many years of the most careful experiment and experience, is much milder than that which prevailed in ancient times. It is not now the dread and fatal disease that it then was. Many severe cases have been cured, and it is by no

means so contagious as was previously supposed. Still further relief for its sufferers is now announced in that two eminent physicians, Kitasato of Japan and Dr. Bouffe of Paris, claim that they have discovered independently the bacillus that causes leprosy and a toxin that will destroy it. The distinguished dermatologist, Dr. George H. Fox, in his last report to the New York Health Department, made the following statement regarding leprosy:

"I can say positively, that during all this time there never has been a single case of infection from one of these patients. The popular impression about leprosy and its contagious features is very erroneous. Leprosy is no more dangerous than consumption. Persons in a street car are very much more likely to contract tuberculosis from the expectoration of a consumptive than to get leprosy from the presence of a leper. Leprosy is, of course, contagious, and probably it can be contracted in accidental ways, as other diseases of the blood are; but the terror of a leper is something that is not founded in fact. Ten years ago a man in a very advanced stage of leprosy was treated here at one of the hospitals, and he recovered, proving that leprosy can be cured. There are other cases just as conclusive; but that man was carefully treated in the hospital, and he received all the comforts of life, whereas, if he had been locked up in a lazaretto, and his food handed to him through a hole, probably he would have died. The great difficulty in curing leprosy is that as soon as a person learns that he has it he is made to believe that all hope is gone. He is treated as a doomed man, and made to believe that he is an object to be shunned by everybody. Naturally enough it is difficult for a person to recover under such circumstances."

Apropos of these statements the following note in *Light and Leading* by the Rev. T. Witton Davies, Principal of the Midland Baptist College, Nottingham, England, may be of interest:

The common belief is that what in the Bible is called leprosy is that which we now understand by that name. So indeed nearly all the commentaries and Bible dictionaries. It is to me surprising that a book so otherwise admirable and up to date as Benzinger's *Hebräische Archäologie* should advocate this view (see page 481). Nevertheless, the identification is certainly wrong.

Modern leprosy is, according to the Norwegian doctors Daneelsen and Boeck, of two kinds—the tubercular and the anæsthetic. Dr. Erasmus Wilson adds a third, what he calls the mutilating species. Now let anyone compare the accounts of those species of leprosy with that so-called in our Bible, and he will have no hesitation in saying that the diseases are quite distinct. Bible leprosy is a comparatively slight complaint. We never read of its proving fatal, nor of its causing the falling off of limbs. Modern leprosy is known to be hereditary, and if it were from this the Jews so much suffered in Palestine, we should expect them to suffer from it now, since they keep so entirely apart from other nationalities. Yet neither in the East

nor in the West are they in any way affected by it, except indeed a very few cases in the East. More important is the fact that the Greek word *lepra*, which is used in the Septuagint and in the New Testament, has, among the Greek medical writers, from the earliest of them Hippocrates (fl. B. C. 450) until medical science passed away from the Greeks, a very definite meaning: that meaning is what medical men now call psoriasis, a word which includes many sorts of skin diseases, none of them particularly serious.

When the translators of the Old Testament into Greek, the writers of the New Testament — Luke the physician especially — and Josephus, make use of this word, they could not have meant anything else than that which always, and alone, it meant in Greek medical works.

The proper Greek word for what we now know as leprosy is elephantiasis, though even this name has, by a misunderstanding of the physicians, come to mean the so-called “Barbados leg.”

In Arabic, as well as in Greek, there are two distinct words for Bible leprosy (*baratz*) and modern leprosy (*judham* — literally, maimed). It is a pity our revisers did not use some word in the margin or in the text of our Bible to indicate what the words rendered leprosy really stand for.

I may be allowed to refer to a somewhat lengthy article by myself on this subject in the *Old and New Testament Student*, September 1890. I am delighted to have my views confirmed by Professor Münch in his able work, *Die Zaraath (Lepra) der herbräischen Bibel* (Leipzig, 1893).